



MINUTES OF SPECIFICATION COMMITTEE MEETING

January 31, 2002

Members Present: Tom Reis, Jim Berger, Ed Kasper for Roger Bierbaum, Will Stein for Mitch Dillavou, LeRoy Bergman for Larry Jesse, Doug McDonald, Gary Novey, and John Smythe.

From FHWA: Frank Howell.

Others Present: Donna Buchwald, Kevin Jones, and Francis Today.

Tom Reis, the Specifications Engineer, opened the meeting. The following items were discussed in accordance with the January 24, 2001, agenda:

1. **CAST Update**

a. **Values**

No change from previous meeting.

b. **Progress Reports**

1. **Project Supervision: John Smythe**

Director Wandro asked that the Contractor Quality Management Specification development and implementation move slowly. Training will be available for the contractors later this season with a pilot project being let fall of 2002.

The Department will be looking into requiring that a Contractor's representative be on the project site at all times when work on the contract is being performed to proactively pursue quality control, coordinate subcontractors, review submittals and submit on time, negotiate extra work, etc. This concept has been discussed with the AGCI.

Article 1108.01 should be reviewed. Article 1105.05 should also be reviewed because the intent of this Article is not being followed. One change that is being considered is to add the following sentence to Article 1105.05, "The provisions of this article cannot be delegated to a subcontractor." It is the intent that the Contractor's superintendent be on the project throughout its duration, and that common practices like delegating project supervision to a subcontractor or any other delegation will not be allowed.

2. Pre-letting: Francis Todey/Tom Reis

A copy of the subgroups' "Roadway Maintenance/Rehabilitation Project Packaging Guidelines" was distributed (see Attachment A). The Director of the Highway Division and the Specification Committee recommend these guidelines be followed when packaging projects.

The On-Call Patching Supplemental Specification was distributed to the contractors on January 14, for their review and comment. The Specification has been revised and it is planned for use in the March 2002 letting. The contractor will not be required to accept the Department's offer.

The Shoulder Aggregate specification (SS-01012) has been developed and will also be used in the March 2002 letting. The Maintenance personnel in the Districts will administer these contracts.

The subgroup's next project is to look at developing a specification for on-call guardrail repair.

3. Materials and Audits: Kevin Jones

Materials I.M. 101, Review of Materials used in Construction and Maintenance Projects, will be in effect with the April 30, 2002, letting. This I.M. provides guidance to the District Materials Engineers and Project Engineers for reviewing documentation of materials accepted into construction and maintenance projects.

Materials I.M. 103, Reimbursement to Iowa Department of Transportation for Inspection Services Provided to Counties and Cities, will be in effect with the April 30, 2002, letting. This I.M. outlines the procedures to be followed for materials inspection and other associated services performed for counties and cities for which reimbursement is required.

The subgroup is still working with the Office of Construction, the contractors, and the Ready Mix Association on quality control testing of some materials properties for structures. The main remaining issue is the lack of trained personnel to perform the testing.

4. Plan Improvement Team: Roger Gould/Tom Reis

The Specification Section is working on incorporating the list of plan quantity by specification into the Specification Book. All of the pipe items were incorporated into the General Supplemental Specification effective for the April 30, 2002, letting. This task is going to be substantially larger than first anticipated due to drastic inconsistencies in Method of Measurement and Basis of Payment for like items. The Specification Section will be working on pipe appurtenances for the General Supplemental Specification effective for the October 29, 2002, letting.

5. Technology and Innovation: future

No report.

6. Training: future

The Department has developed and is currently teaching a Contract Administration Training Course for the Maintenance personnel that will be working on construction inspection this upcoming construction season.

District 1 training has been completed and appears to have been well received. It also appears that a basic math course may be needed, especially in the area of volumes.

b. Work Plan, Milestones, and Time Line

No report.

c. Communication

- 1. Industry**
- 2. Employees**
- 3. Counties & cities**

The Specification Section has been asked to give several presentations to industry groups this winter on C.A.S.T. activities and where the Department is heading. The Office of Construction will also be addressing the topic during their Winter Training Seminars. It was reported that Director Wandro briefly referenced the C.A.S.T. activities at a recent AGCI meeting.

d. Miscellaneous

It was reported that at the last Highway Division Management Team meeting, that there was an interest in reducing the amount of Change Orders and their amounts. A lot of people believe that Change Orders are for embellishments, and that is rarely the case.

Most Change Orders are a result of inaccurate or missed quantities on the plans. The most common Change Order is for subdrains. Because of a lack of documentation on exact locations of subdrains, there is not a method to determine an accurate quantity of subdrains in the plan preparation stage of a project.

2. Article 1107.07 Safety, Health, Pollution, and Sanitation

The Office of Construction requested a change to Article 1107.07 that will eliminate the Contractor's requirement to notify the Engineer of safety inspections.

The Contractor is responsible for compliance with OSHA regulations and their own safety program. Enforcement of this specification duplicates effort and is administratively burdensome for the contractors and Project Engineer staff. This recommendation is made to eliminate unnecessary paperwork, eliminate method requirements for safety requirements, and streamline contract administration. The Specifications require the Contractor to comply with OSHA requirements anyway, so there is no value added to the project.

Delete the second paragraph of **Article 1107.07, Safety, Health, Pollution, and Sanitation.**

~~A safety inspection will be required at the beginning of each major phase of the operation. Repeated inspections may be necessary for phases of long duration. All safety inspections shall be made and reported by the Contractor's safety officer, even though that phase of the operation may be subcontracted. The times of these inspections should be identified at the preconstruction conference or before work is started. The Engineer shall be given reasonable notice with an opportunity to witness the inspection, and the Engineer shall receive a copy of a written report.~~

The Specification Committee **approved** the above requested change for the **October 29, 2002, General Supplemental Specification.**

3. Article 4121.01 Description (Granular Subbase Material)

The Office of Materials requested a change to Article 4121.01 that will allow some softer stones to be used for granular subbase material.

Increasing the LA Abrasion limit to 50% was recommended by the aggregate producers and Materials Quality Review Group.

Replace "45%" with "50%" in the first sentence of **Article 4121.01, A, Abrasion and Clay Content**.

The Specification Committee **approved** the above requested change for the **October 29, 2002, General Supplemental Specification**.

4. Article 1102.17, D, 3, c, Contractors With History of Utilizing DBEs

The Office of Contracts requested a change to Article 1102.07, D, 3, c, that will extend the time for collecting past history of contractors utilizing DBEs.

The contracting industry asked if the Department would change the period of time that is consider for contractors with a history of using DBEs from "the previous federal fiscal year and the current fiscal year-to-date" to "the 24 months prior to the letting". The Office of Contracts agreed with the industry's comments that dropping and adding a month at a time is better than dropping a whole fiscal year each October.

Replace the first two paragraphs of **Article 1102.17, D, 3, c, Contractors with History of Utilizing DBEs**.

A bidder who has demonstrated their ability to utilize DBE firms on both Federal-aid and non-Federal-aid projects let by the Department in the **previous Federal fiscal year 24 months prior to the letting** will be assumed to have made a Good Faith Effort to achieve the project goal.

The Department's objective evaluation of prior usage of DBE firms will include all contracts let by the Department that were awarded to the Contractor during the the **previous Federal fiscal year and the year-to-date of the current fiscal year 24 months prior to the letting**. The calculation will include the sum of the following:

Replace the first paragraph of **Article 1102.17, D, 3, c, 1.**

1) One point for each percentage of average DBE subcontracted dollars for the **previous Federal fiscal year and the year-to-date 24 months prior to the letting** (e.g. an average 7.5% dollars subcontracted to DBE equals 7.5 points)

The Specification Committee **approved** the above requested changes for the **October 29, 2002, General Supplemental Specification. This item will require Administrative Rules Committee approval.**

5. Specification Committee Business

The Specifications Engineer requested a general discussion concerning several topics concerning Specification Committee business.

Periodically the Committee needs to discuss the timing issues of how some of the business operations are handled so that all involved parties and affected customers are aware when things happen in the specifications world. Following are the topics that were discussed:

A. Number of meetings per year

The Specifications Engineer recommended that the Specifications Committee hold four meetings per year. Based on the actual number of meetings held in the past two years, this would work. This also fits into the scheme of having at least one meeting for discussion of materials to include in the next issue of the GS.

The Specification Committee agreed that scheduling the meeting for the year and then not holding them is not a bad thing. This reserves the time incase a meeting needs to be held, and frees up time if a meeting is not needed.

With the move to 12 lettings per year, the schedule will have to be changed. The Specification Section will review the other major Department meetings and the new monthly letting schedule; and develop a draft schedule for the future.

B. Project Scheduling

The processing of Special Provisions impacts the Specifications Section approximately 30 weeks per year based on the current schedule. Knowing what projects are in the letting is crucial to the Specification Section being able to efficiently and in a timely fashion process these SPs. The Specifications Section has been seeing a large number of projects that require SPs and have not been entered into the Project Scheduling System.

The Office of Construction is experiencing some of the same frustrations with the lack of accurate information in the System. They use the System for such things as engineering assignments.

C. Developmental Specification

Due to the large number of projects beginning to utilize the same SPs over and over with no modifications, in addition to several of the quality management specifications beginning to become very popular, the Specification Section proposed the use of a new type of specification, the Developmental Specification (DS).

The DS will be similar to an SS in that it is used over and over, while using the same number until the specification is modified using redline and strikeout; however the Specification Section will still deliver a list to the Office of Contracts each letting that lists the particular projects that would require the DS to be assigned to them. This would save a tremendous amount of work for the Specifications Section, save time for the customers by not having to read each DS as they do now for an SP, and it would not have the confusing aspects as it would if it were issued as an SS. Following are a few of the types of SSs or SPs that could utilize this new DS status:

Polk Co Water Mains (very infrequently changed)
I-235 Bridge Removal by Blasting
I-235 High Performance Concrete for Structures
QM-E

Replace the list in **Article 1105.04**, Conformity with and Coordination of the Contract Documents.

1. Addendum
2. Proposal Form
3. Special Provision
4. Plans
5. Developmental Specification
- ~~5- 6.~~ Supplemental Specifications
- ~~6- 7.~~ Standard Specifications
- ~~7- 8.~~ Materials I.M.

The Specification Committee **approved** the above requested change for the **October 29, 2002, General Supplemental Specification. This item will require Administrative Rules Committee approval.**

D. Specification Section Annual Schedule Review

1) GS

Release dates, deadlines for submittals, etc. were not discussed.

2) ERL

Release dates, future direction, etc were not discussed.

3) Letting schedule

The Office of Contracts stated that they are currently looking at a 5 or 6 week turn in at which time the plans will be locked and no changes will be allowed. The plans may be turned in 2 weeks prior to that for review if the designer wishes. This change is all based on full implementation of the Department's Print-on-Demand process.

Field Construction has concerns that the plans they receive for their review are not the same plans that are turned into the Office of Contracts. The field spends a lot of time reviewing the plans that are submitted to them. In some cases their comments were already addressed and the plans have already been changed. The design offices are having problems getting plans on time from the consultants and are getting the plans for their review at the time that plans have to be sent out to the field for review. They were also unaware that the plans are supposed to be final when they are sent to the field for review.

The Office of Construction asked the Design Offices to send a note to the field explaining what they are sending the field and what they are expecting from the field review process.

The meeting was adjourned.

Donna L. Buchwald, P.E.
Assistant Specification Engineer

DLB

cc: Bobby Blackmon, FHWA
Bill Knopf, AGCI
Robert Cramer, Cramer & Associates, Inc.

Roadway Maintenance/Rehabilitation Project Packaging Guidelines

Work Type	Minimum Practical Size	Optimum Size	Maximum Size	Area Limitation	Ties with other Work Types	Tied Projects or Divisions	Urgency of Work	Optimum Letting Time
Crack & Joint Cleaning & Sealing (HMA)	\$100,000	-	\$500,000	None	Cleaning & filling cracks (HMA) Joint cleaning & sealing (PCC)	Divisions	Low	March - July
Cleaning & Filling Cracks (HMA)	\$100,000	-	\$500,000	None	Crack cleaning & sealing (HMA) Joint cleaning & sealing (PCC)	Divisions	Low	March - July
Crack & Joint Cleaning & Sealing (PCC)	\$100,000	-	\$500,000	None	Crack cleaning & sealing (HMA) Cleaning & filling cracks (HMA)	Divisions	Low	March - July
Patching (PCC, HMA)	\$100,000	-	\$500,000	None	Partial/full depth patching (HMA) Partial/full depth patching (PCC)	Projects	Med.-High	Jan. - April
Area Patching Contract (PCC, HMA)	-	-	\$100,000	None	None - Work completed on an on call basis.	-	High	Jan. - March
Area Shoulder Aggregate Contract	\$10,000	-	\$200,000	None	-	Divisions	High	Jan. - March
3R Resurfacing (HMA)	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$5,000,000	30 mile radius	MP HMA Resurfacing	Projects	Med.-High	July & Oct. - Feb.
MP Resurfacing (HMA)	\$250,000	-	\$800,000	75 mile radius	3R HMA Resurfacing	Projects	High	January - May

Note - When planning projects, consideration should be given to balancing the amount of work flow in different crafts from year to year.